

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/018,117	GUDERIAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Cephia D. Toomer	1714	

All Participants:

 (1) Cephia D. Toomer.

 (2) Edward Freedman.
Status of Application: non-final

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 2 August 2004
Time: _____

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

27

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner informed Mr. Freedman that claim 27, a product-by-process claim, is not patentable. The examiner explained the rationale behind her decision and asked Mr. Freedman if he would cancel claim 27. Mr. Freedman stated that he needed something in writing to present to his clients before such a decision could be made. The examiner stated that she would send out another office action.